DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 566 95 CG 009 170

AUTHOR Ruch, Charles P.
TITLE Staff and Program Development for a New Pupil Personnel Services Professional: Final Report 1.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE Jul 74
GRANT OEG-0-70-2021(725)
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; Educational Programs; *Inservice Education; *Preservice Education; Program Descriptions; Program Improvement; *Pupil Personnel Services; *Training

ABSTRACT

This is the first in a series of final reports to the Office of Education on the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project. This multi-year, multi-institutional project was an attempt to redesign the training of pupil personnel specialists for the schools through preservice training for entry-level personnel and pre- or inservice training for faculty, and to improve the modes for the delivery of services in five urban settings. Project activities encompass: (1) a center demonstration component, (2) five satellite projects, and (3) a set of supporting staff and program development activities sponsored by the center. This report explicates the several dimensions of this complex educational personnel development venture, and serves as a "Gestalt" for viewing the total project. It draws heavily on the many documents, reports, and plans of operation already generated by the project. The authors emphasize the strategies and processes of the center and its components. The satellite project reports are not presented in this document but will be forthcoming at a later date. (Author/PC)

ED 096566

STAFF AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOR A NEW PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES PROFESSIONAL

Final Report I

Charles P. Ruch

Center Director (1971-4)

July 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Series of Final Reports

of the

Northeastern EPDA/PPS

Center-Satellite Project

Department of Counselor Education

University of Pittsburgh

and

SUCNY Brockport - Boston University - Buffalo Public Schools

Duquesne University - D.C. Public Schools

CG 009 170

The NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite project at the University of Pittsburgh and its five subcontracted Satellites are supported, in part, by funds from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (OE Grant No. OEG-0-70-2021 (725))

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education or any of the participating institutions, and no official endorsement by any agency should be implied.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

I. Introduction 1

II. Objectives 4

III. Strategy 13

IV. Design 17

V. Development 28

VI. Major Outcomes 37

VII. Issues, Problems and Recommendations 49

Appendix 56

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From the first meeting sponsored by the PPS/LTI and OE to introduce the Center/Satellite model (Phoenix, Jan. 1971) to the most recent meeting where dissemination of new ideas, institutionalization of project gains, and ways of continued staff and program development were discussed (Falmouth, Ma., July, 1974), the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project has been the responsibility of many individuals. I am pleased to recognize their hard work, co-operation and willingness to pursue this most interesting educational personnel development project. Their names, too numerous to list here, appear elsewhere in this report.

I am especially pleased to acknowledge the support and assistance of these groups. Administratively, both at the Office of Education in the persons of Drs. Pat McGreevy and Dustin Wilson, and at the University of Pittsburgh, through Deans Kelly and Masoner, the project has received enthusiastic support and assistance.

Second, the faculty of the Department of Counselor Education willingly gave, as is their custom and reputation, energy and creativity to the project.

Finally, the project enjoyed the tireless support of its senior secretary, Marj Osborne who managed all fiscal transactions and logistical details. A special thanks to Gretchen Boss who assisted in the preparation of this manuscript.

From Phoenix to Falmouth . . . it was a good trip.

Charles Ruch
Pittsburgh, Pa.
July, 1974

NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS
CENTER-SATELLITE PROJECT

(September 1970 - July 1974)

I. INTRODUCTION

> *The EPDA Pupil Personnel Services Program encourages the creation of a new (not merely an additional) professional, more versatile than his many colleagues and predecessors, one who is able to relate as effectively to the individual student as to the individual teacher and to groups of either students or teachers, and who can, at the same time, see the school system as a whole while being concerned with the growth of the individual. In short, the goal of the program is to train professionals who will train others to deal with individuals as well as groups, and with the system as well as its administrators, teachers and students. (EPDA/PPS Program Design, Sept., 1970)*

This is the first in a series of final reports to the Office of Education (OE) on behalf of the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project. This multi-year, multi-institutional activity was an attempt to redesign the training of pupil personnel specialists for the schools through pre-service training for entry level personnel and pre- or in-service training for faculty, (counselors, social workers, etc.), and to improve the modes for the delivery of PPS service in five urban settings in the northeast. Project activities encompass three interrelated components: 1) a Center Demonstration component involving the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Pittsburgh, cooperating school-community sites, and a variety of

agency-community situations, 2) five Satellite projects (Boston, Mass., Buffalo, N.Y., the local Pittsburgh area, Rochester, N.Y., and the District of Columbia) and, 3) a set of supporting staff and program development activities sponsored by the Center.

The project, an outgrowth of an EPDA Guidance and Counseling Institute, (1970-71) covered the three year period 1971-74. The Center and each Satellite annually recruited and trained personnel who are designing, developing, and potentially operating innovative School Counseling and/or Pupil Personnel Services training programs with special emphasis for the urban condition. In Satellite projects the participants were recruited and selected jointly by the training institution and a cooperating local educational agency to provide for the development of institutional, as well as personal, commitments. At the Center Demonstration component some participants were mutually recruited. All full time students in the Department of Counselor Education participated in project sponsored training.

At this writing (July 1974) the project is contracted to conduct culmination and institutionalization activities with the Satellites through December 30, 1974. In addition, the Center will conduct a year of dissemination activities during 1974-75. These two separate projects will be reported in two additional documents in this series.

In addition, each of the five Satellite projects; Boston, Mass., Buffalo, N.Y., Rochester, N.Y., Duquesne (Pittsburgh, Pa.) and Washington D.C. will contribute a final report which will be a part of this series.

As the first of the series, this report seeks to explicate the

several dimensions of this complex educational personnel development venture and should serve as a "Gestalt" for viewing the total project. It draws heavily on the many documents, reports, plans of operation, etc., already generated by the project. However, the organization and emphasis are the responsibility of the author. This report will emphasize the strategies and processes of the Center and the Center Demonstration components; Satellites will present their own reports. In retrospect, the totality of this venture can only be appreciated as the reader synthesizes for himself the issues and perspectives generated between and among all the component parts of this project.

II. OBJECTIVES

The Center-Satellite Project discussed herein, was one of a number of projects which comprised the national PPS program. The evolution of this project reflects the changing priorities of the national program; as well as an attempt to maintain an innovative, potent educational personnel development program within the Department of Counselor Education, University of Pittsburgh.

The National Program. The PPS Center-Satellite program model evolved from over a decade of OE experience with the training of school counselors, school psychologists and other pupil personnel specialists. While others (McGreevy, 1971, Malcolm, 1974) have more completely described and assessed this evolution, several comments about the antecedents of the Center-Satellite program are necessary to put this and the following documents in context and perspective.

The Institute Program sponsored under title V-B of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 provided a major training effort for thousands of school counselors. In addition, it was clearly responsible for upgrading the quality and substance of counselor education programs in colleges and universities. Without in any way demeaning the many documented accomplishments of the NDEA program, several limitations and needs for new priorities became evident by the close of the program in 1968. The competitive nature of the funding procedures produced

minimal inter-institutional cooperation, dissemination of new techniques, or mutual support. Multi year funding, deemed necessary for institutional change, was not possible. The universities dominated the Institute program with little involvement for local schools, state agencies or community groups. Seldom was there direct opportunity for trainers (university faculty) to be retrained. Finally, much of the training provided under the Institute program emphasized a counselor role which relied heavily on one-to-one or group counseling as the primary intervention skill and strategy.

Several of these priorities were added to comprise the Support Personnel Program conducted under the Education Professional Development Act (E.P.D.A.) during 1969-71. Projects were directed to a wider array of PPS workers in a variety of institutions. Projects involving social workers, psychologists, etc., were funded through local educational agencies or state departments, as well as universities. An arrangement known as Clustering, (Malcolm and Brown, 1972, Forest and Malcolm, 1974, Anderson and Cady, 1974, Poling, 1974) brought projects together on both a regional and topical basis for mutual support and self-renewal. Community involvement, consortium arrangements, and inter-institutional teaming were piloted.

A national panel was convened by the Office of Education to provide support services for the program. Known as the Leadership Training Institute (LTI), this panel supported inter project activities, held conferences and meetings and provided technical assistance (G.D. Moore and Margolis, 1971, J.W. Moore, 1971, M. Salim, 1971, A. Riccio, 1971).

In spite of these developments, there was still a minimum of institutional change, a minimum of integrated role/function for PPS workers, and an absence of redefinition and retraining for the trainer, rather than for the worker. The Center-Satellite program model was an aggressive attempt to create a new structure to respond to these reoccuring issues and priorities.

Although the program design and model has been disseminated and discussed (McGreevy, 1971, Malcolm, 1974), several of its features are reported here as a prelude to the more specific activities reported in the remaining sections. The national program objectives were:

I. To improve the qualifications of the trainers and supervisors of pupil personnel specialists.

II. To develop programs which
   a. Contain cooperative planning and evaluative arrangements among the university, the school, and related community agencies.
   b. Train pupil personnel specialists and other members of the school staff to function together as a team.
   c. Design, implement and evaluate PPS training programs of an experimental nature that are appropriate for low income area schools (e.g., store front, use of para-professionals, etc.)

III. To recruit and train members of minority groups as pupil personnel specialists.

IV. To bring about, both in the institution which prepare pupil personnel specialists and in the schools where they function, organizational change which will facilitate achieving the goals stated above. (EPDA/PPS Program Design, Sept., 1970, p.8).

To respond to these objectives, the Office of Education funded a number of inter-related university-school districts-community settings where both the training of PPS workers and the delivery of service could be reassessed and redesigned. Seven regional projects were created

for the three year period (1971-1974). One setting (Center) provided the major leadership (fiscal, administrative, and programmatic) for the collection of four to seven smaller settings (Satellites). It was envisioned that the Center would play a significant and continued role in training the Satellite personnel, who would, in turn, develop local programmatic efforts.

Special significance was placed on Objective III, "to recruit and train members of minority groups as pupil personnel specialists." Each of the seven Centers has placed an emphasis on the minority groups residing in the geographic area served by the project. Minority recruitment, selection and placement characterized each Center. Each Center has sponsored curricula innovation and field setting development directed toward making PPS training more relevant to the needs of minority students. The seven Centers in the PPS Center-Satellite Program were:

California State University, Hayward,
Indiana University,
University of New Mexico,
University of Pittsburgh,
University of South Dakota,
Tennessee State University/University of Tennessee, and
Pan American University/University of Texas, Austin.

Each Center-Satellite project was free (and encouraged) within programmatic and contractual limitations, to develop unique strategies and processes for achieving the program goals. The regional and multi-institutional nature of the program design provided a rich array of

resources which, when inter-connected, provided a potent strategy for the improvement of PPS services for all children.

Project Objectives:

The overall objective of the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project was the design, development and dissemination of innovative Pupil Personnel Services (P.P.S.) and teacher development (T.D.) training programs, practices, and personnel. Three integrated components; Center, Center Demonstration Component and Satellite projects contribute toward the achievement of this overall objective. The specific objectives for these components were as follows:

I. Center

The overall objective was the design, development and operation of a network of innovative P.P.S. and teacher development training projects in five urban cities in the northeastern region. Objectives specific to the development of this Center-Satellite network include:

a. The identification, design, development and contracting of five satellite projects consistent with the current Office of Education guidelines.

b. To support the operation and development of these Satellite projects through Center coordination, consultation, dissemination and program development activities.

c. To develop Satellite programs through staff development and training activities focusing on critical issues in P.P.S. and teacher development training.

d. To manage the Center-Satellite network through fiscal,

management and evaluative activities.

2. Center Demonstration Component

The Center (University of Pittsburgh), Department of Counselor Education will recruit, train and place trainer level (doctoral) and entry level (masters) personnel including individuals from the five Satellite projects. In addition, all full time Counselor Education students at Pittsburgh will participate in Center sponsored training.

The Center training program was characterized by:

- full time, long term,
- field based,
- individualized, competency-based,
- interdisciplinary teams,
- multi level, multi institutional training.

Two field based models for P.P.S. personnel were developed and demonstrated through local training, both preservice and inservice.

a. Teams of personnel from within the pupil personnel services, e.g., counselor, social worker, nurse, psychologist, psychiatrists, probation officer, child care worker, etc.

b. Teams of personnel including P.P.S. personnel and other educational personnel, e.g., counselor/consultants, teacher, administrator, curriculum specialists, reading specialists, etc. (See following chart)

Objectives specific to individual participants area:

(1) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who have a broad

ALTERNATIVE P.P.S. TEAM MODELS

A. Pupil Personnel Specialists with Educators

(team composition)	(emphasis)	(training)
Pupil Personnel Specialists	development	pre-service
Teacher(s)	educative	in-service
Curriculum Specialists	general population	multi level
Reading Specialists		multi discipline
Administrators		

B. Within Pupil Personnel Specialties

(team composition)	(emphasis)	(training)
Pupil Personnel Specialist	re educative	pre-service
Behavior Modification Specialist	rehabilitative	in-service
Prescriptive Educational Specialist	re socialization	multi level
Mental Health Personnel	special population	multi discipline
Social Service Personnel		
Legal Personnel		

developmental perspective and who can utilize their understanding of learning processes, motivation, personality dynamics and techniques of individual counseling in working with individual students.

(2) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers skilled in developing learning environments who will translate their understanding of individual learning styles, behavioral dynamics, and effects of the learning environment into the development of school and community experiences which meet the needs of the learner and allow him to fully actualize his learning potential.

(3) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who will effectively use their knowledge and skills in the role of consultants with teachers, administrators, and community representatives.

(4) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who have effective understandings of social structures and relationships and communication processes and who have the skills to utilize such understandings in effecting better communication within the school system and between the school and the community.

(5) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who understand people interacting in group situations and who can utilize this knowledge in developing better working relationships among groups of students, teachers, and administrators.

(6) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who will develop projects which will bring about greater involvement and cooperation between the community and the school toward the end of creating a developmental environment.

(7) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who can effectively

work with school personnel specialists (psychologists, reading specialists, curriculum supervisors, special education teachers, social workers, nurses, etc.), as well as with outside professionals.

(8) To train counselors and P.P.S. trainers who are aware of and who effectively reinforce and maximize the role of the home environment in positive learning, personality development, attitude and value formulation, and in providing motivation for students.

In addition the Center Demonstration component will support in-staff positions (graduate assistants) and continue to train a number of potential P.P.S. supervisory and/or trainer level personnel. Highest priority for filling these staff positions will be given to both Affirmative Action priorities of the University of Pittsburgh, Department of Counselor Education and identified needs of cooperating Local Education Agencies and Institutions of Higher Education.

3. Satellite Training

Each Satellite will design, develop and conduct an educational personnel training program. The overall objective for the Satellite program will be either:

a. The design, development, and piloting of a new model for P.P.S. training and teacher development, or

b. The design, development and implementation of a critical component in the training of P.P.S. personnel and teacher improvement.

Specific objectives for each Satellite were presented in the satellites' Plans of Operation appended to the Center project document.

III. STRATEGY

The project developed a strategy for both personal and institutional change based on experience through the conduct of a number of educational personnel development projects. Through previous experience with a series of educational personnel development projects an overall strategy was developed which involves the coordinated integration of three primary functions, 1) management, 2) program development, and 3) staff development.

An integrated theory of change is emerging from these experiences and includes these dimensions of the Center's change strategy.

1) The function of management is to provide the conditions and the resources under which the program development and staff development activities may take place in a coordinated fashion. Experience has suggested that programmatic changes in the absence of appropriate training is a futile activity, whereas, the antithesis is an equally unrewarding strategy. Both require management support. (the Center component)

2) It was postulated that the Center should provide both the leadership and the risk taking environment in the development of innovative training programs and models. Consequently, the Center piloted a variety of training strategies and a variety of program development activities, processes, and structures (the Center Demonstration component).

Furthermore, these pilot activities should receive maximum visibility. It is through this demonstration of pilot components that a variety of errors can be identified, unproductive strategies can be isolated and that rewarding alternative processes and opportunities can be highlighted. (Pittsburgh Center-Satellite Meetings; Jan. 9-11, 1971; Feb. 28-Mar. 1, 1972; June 27-29, 1973).

It is further suggested that this should be a place where alternative forms of resource distribution, management styles, and training modes might be explored. Therefore it is extremely important in the overall strategy for the Center Demonstration component to be involved in all aspects of the project that might reasonably be expected from the satellites. (Two models for PPS Teams, in service and pre service, variety of field sites, entry level and dispensing level training, minority recruitment, etc.) This provides a variety of experiences around which to build satellite and Center activities.

3) A third dimension was that each Satellite project must be provided with the conditions, resources, and priorities necessary for program and staff development. A considerable portion of the Center's resources were allocated to Satellite development. Each Satellite operated its own training program which involved students, trainees, universities, school districts, communities, etc. The satellites were to be involved in and responsible for many of the social processes, at one time, so a reform strategy for their setting could be at all successful.

(4) Another dimension of the overall Center/Satellite strategy involves the support, dissemination, and the expansion of the goals, objectives, strategies, models, personnel and programs in both the Satellites and the Center components. (Information exchange). Therefore, a percentage of the Center's resources, both personal and fiscal, were set aside for short term, intermittent program and staff development activities. Programmatically, this involved a series of conferences, workshops, personnel exchanges, meetings, dissemination of materials so that all parts of the Center-Satellite network are forced to both become aware of what other parts are doing and also to explicate and expose the kind of activities that they are involved in to each other. (see appendix of chronology of activities) As this expansion, explication, and communication process continued over time, gaps were identified in both Center and Satellite activities which involve specific short term training needs (training viewed in a broad context). The Center then had available resources in response to both individual or collective Satellite and/or Center component needs for short term training. By taking personnel away from the existing projects for periods of time, exposing them to new ideas, thoughts, processes, structures, strategies and then returning them back with the expectation that they will continue to expand and operate their existing projects, significant change is possible.

5) In support of these personnel development activities were programmatic strategies whereby intra-institutional and inter-institutional commitments were gathered, explicated and institutionalized. Positions

were created and roles developed, policies were altered, procedures were reviewed and modified, and practice was influenced. This involved the securing of institutional commitments to other institutions, whereby personal changes are transcended and enhanced.

6) Long term training at the Center Demonstration component for Satellite personnel recruited from and to be returned to the Satellite projects provide an additional dimension to the overall change strategy. (see appended data)

7) Since the primary target area for the Northeastern PPS Center was urban settings, a key dimension to the overall change strategy was the identification, programmatic support and requisite training of persons sensitive to, and with a commitment to the urban scene. The recognition that a great number of minority persons, predominately Black, and in some northeastern cities, Puerto Rican, are absent in the educational rank suggests strongly that a high priority for training of entry level and new supervisory personnel was given to persons from these minority populations. (see appended data)

In summary, the overall change strategy involved the integration of three functions, management, program development and staff development. Management provides the conditions and resources. Program development focuses on providing those institutional, inter- and intra-, commitments necessary for project growth. Staff development provides the personnel, their training and support to assume new roles, functions and responsibilities made available through the development of the program. Thus the cycle continues.

IV. DESIGN

In presenting the design for the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project three interrelated dimensions will be discussed; structure, processes, and governance.

A. Structure

This project was organized so as to involve three interrelated components; Center component, Center Demonstration component, and five Satellite components. Each will be discussed and are highlighted in the following chart.

1. Center Component

The design, development and plans for Center activities are illustrated in the following chart. The generic Office of Education (OE) program model suggested four functions for the Center. These included: (1) Identification, introduction and explanation of O.E. guidelines and priorities and subcontracting, (2) the creation and maintenance of program development processes to assist the Satellite in the conduct of its program, (3) the providing of a series of staff development activities designed to support and enhance the Satellite's program development and operation and (4) the fiscal, programmatic, disseminative and evaluative functions between and among other Centers, Satellites, L.T.I., O.E. and other interested and appropriate individuals and/or institutions.

NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS
CENTER-SATELLITE PROJECT
STRUCTURE

Pittsburgh Demonstration Component	Center Component	Satellite Components
Concurrent PPS + TE Field Based Training		Boston
Field Sites	Management	Buffalo
M.Ed. + Doctoral Program	Program Development	Pittsburgh (Duquesne & Carlow)
2 PPS Role Models		Rochester
Inservice & Preservice Training	Staff Development	Washington D.C.

In this project, the Center was not viewed as a place; but rather, a set of resources and a series of processes whereby these resources could be used to both support and enhance the Center Demonstration component and the Satellite projects with management, staff and program development activities.

2. Satellite Components

An integral part of the Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center were five Satellite projects. They are summarized in the following chart. Satellite projects were smaller PPS projects in an identified urban area. Each became a multi-institutional setting involving University, School District and community personnel joined together in the conduct of a specific set of training, program development and delivery of service activities. Satellites were the major point for innovation, development, training and service.

3. Center Demonstration Component

This component comprised the full time Masters and Doctoral programs and was an extension of the type of program for educational personnel training developed over the past six years in the University of Pittsburgh's Counselor Education Department in conjunction with the disciplines and other education departments through the vehicle of three full year NDEA Institutes and two EPDA Institutes. These training programs have a number of emphases which give them potency exceeding the graduate training program designed in the usual fashion.

Experiences in the curricula are structured to provide students with optimal opportunities for their own personal development while at the same time providing them with theoretical and practical

SATELLITES

BOSTON: Comprehensive Mental Health Team (Counselor, Social Worker, Nurse, Psychiatric resident) training and service in inner city Elementary School.

*Boston Univ.
Several schools

BUFFALO: Training inner city P.P.S. workers - common recruitment, selection, training, field work, placement.

*Buffalo Public Schools
SUNY - Buffalo

PITTSBURGH: Joint pre-service and in-service training of teachers and P.P.S. in/for Community school.

*Duquesne and Carlow
Elementary School

ROCHESTER: Redesign and retraining, (both pre and in-service) of P.P.S. and teachers in both innovative suburban and redesigning inner city schools.

*Rochester School District
*Greece Central School District
*SCUNY - Brockport

WASHINGTON, D.C.: Concurrent in-service training and model development for P.P.S. and teachers in inner city, community based Jr. High.

*Garnet-Patterson Jr. High
Howard University

* holds subcontract

experiences that will enable them to function effectively as educators. Many of the elements, processes, and conditions conducive to maximal personal development in education are operational within the program so that students will not only be told about educational processes but will learn from their experience of them.

Significant dimensions of the Center's training activities are illustrated below.

a) Where ever possible joint recruitment, selection, and placement with Satellites, local districts, etc.

b) Innovative Training characterized by:

full time, long term,

field based,

individually negotiated, competency based,

interdisciplinary teams,

multi level, multi institution training.

c) Demonstration of two field based models for interdisciplinary functioning.

Teams within PPS, e.g., counselor, social work, psychologist, child care, probation officer, etc.

Teams within education, e.g., counselor, teacher, administrator, reading specialist, etc.

d) Variety of field sites.

B. Processes

The Center-Satellite program targets two kinds of objectives or outcomes, each necessitating a specific though inter-related set of strategies. The training of educational personnel, graduate faculty

to para-professionals, is staff development. Changing the training programs for PPS specialists or the delivery of services for such workers is another kind of outcome; program development. The presence and inter-relationship of both is deemed critical to any meaningful reform or planned change processes. Both were present in all components of this Center-Satellite project. In addition, the Center, per se; was responsible for the management processes for the overall project.

1. Center Specific

The major project processes facilitated through the Center are outlined on the following chart.

Satellite Identification. The five Satellite institutions and personnel were jointly identified by the Office of Education and Center personnel. All were characterized by joint urban university and urban school district involvement. All had developed Pupil Personnel Services in the schools and Counselor Education programs in the universities. All faced problems common to urban areas, i.e., population mobility, low income, unemployment, large bureaucratic schools, research oriented universities, etc. Across the five satellites, several aspects of the total PPS model were found, yet no Satellite (or the Center site) had all of the characteristics. Hence, the potential for mutual teaching, learning and sharing was a requisite part of the identification process.

Program Development. The Center assisted the Satellites in the development of either an innovative model for Pupil Personnel

CENTER ACTIVITIES & PROCESSES

A. - Identify Satellite Institutions & Personnel,

- Introduce New O.E. Guidelines & Priorities, and

- Subcontracting.

B. - Support Satellite Program Development

Co-ordination	Meetings Workshops Institutes Conferences
Consultation	Visitations Materials
Management	Consultants Lecturers Demonstrations

C. - Support Satellite Staff Development

Supervision	Workshops Institutes Conferences
Group Work	Meetings Visitations
Consultation	Materials Consultants
Training	Lecturers Demonstrations

D. - Manage Center-Satellite Project

fiscal	dissemination
programmatic	evaluation

Service training or some component thereof. Coordination, consultation and program management were provided from the Center's staff or from other resources within the project. Each Satellite was coordinated by a Center coordinator on a quarter time basis. The coordinator was free to spend one-fourth time monthly at the Satellite and had access to the full range of supporting Center-Satellite activities including meetings, workshops, conferences, etc., many of which were designed in response to Satellite needs. (See the Center report, CHANGES FACING PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES. TRAINING AND SERVICE, A REPORT OF SIX WORKSHOPS, Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite Project, Department of Counselor Education, University of Pittsburgh, February, 1974.)

Staff Development. In addition to program development responsibilities, each coordinator assisted in the design, development and conduct of a variety of short term conferences, workshops, and other staff development activities. Topics critical to Pupil Personnel Service training will form the content of such activities including: groups, supervision, consultation, teaming, interdisciplinary models, field involvement, etc. (See above cited Report.)

Management. The Center director and his staff were responsible for the appropriate fiscal, programmatic, disseminative, and evaluative activities as deemed necessary by the Office of Education, Leadership Training Institute, the Center, and Satellites. A series of Center-Satellite directors' and coordinators meetings were conducted to achieve communication, decision making and planning functions. A chronology of project sponsored meetings, workshops, and activities is appended.

2. Satellite or Center Demonstration Component Specific

The major focus of the five Satellites and the Pitt Demonstration component was on the development of PPS specialists and trainers (People) and on training or service programs (Programs). The complementary processes of staff and program development permeated the project.

While much has been written in recent years regarding educational personnel development, several specific notions about training are unique to this Center project. These include: (a) fusion of personal and professional development as the core around which training programs are designed, (b) use of clinical supervision and field experiences, (c) use of double practica for training trainers, and (d) development of significant impacts from community resources.

With respect to the development of programs, this project has emphasized (a) long term commitments, (b) institutional change strategies involving joint institutional commitments, sharing of resources, etc., (c) specific recruitment, selection, placement strategies linking people with institutions, and (d) targeted specific training and support activities.

These strategies and processes will be further explicated, both in this and other documents in this series.

C. Policy and Governance

The Center project involved a network of interrelated, educational training and development activities. A variety of educational institutions in five northeastern cities were involved. The Center was committed to the demonstration and operation of a policy formulation and decision making model that is consistent with both the multiple goals

of the project and the multiple involvements of constituents of the many institutions and communities involved. A decentralized decision-making and policy formulation model was established. Essentially, it was an attempt to get away from a centralized, bureaucratic representative kind of system and tried to create a system where people involved in a particular situation do not vote or act through representation in resolving the issues in program design or implementation in that situation, but rather get involved in a more immediate consensual kind of organization and decision making. Consequently, a variety of ad hoc decision making groups were established and operated.

1. Policy making for the Center: Those Center activities involving the integration of the Center demonstration component and satellite activities were developed through a directors meetings which were held periodically. Members of this group include all satellite directors, coordinators for each satellite for the center, and representatives from the Center's demonstration program. This group had the responsibility to plan, design, operate and evaluate those resources alloted to center activities.

2. Policy making for each Satellite: Each satellite was free to develop its own response to the issue of policy formation and decision making and these were explicated in the several documents of the Satellite.

3. Policy making Models for the Pitt Demonstration component was designed to take two forms: (a) a site committee for each training site, and (b) a core faculty for each training program.

(a) Site Committees: The P.P.S. program at Pitt worked to develop a parity committee in each of the places where the Center was functioning. The goal of the Center at Pitt was to establish a full P.P.S. training and training of P.P.S. trainers program in each place that represents a different kind of community, a different type of student, a different type of school district. It was attempted to make the P.P.S. and P.P.S. trainers fully functional within the context of these various school, community, student situations. Consequently, in each training site some form of a Site committee was encouraged.

The Site committee could be initiated around parents, students, and teachers from a particular school building within a particular community. Into this committee might be inserted representation from administration, and from the School of Education at Pitt. It is from within this committee that management, design and decision making about the development of the training program for P.P.S. personnel in the site would emerge.

(b) Program Core-Faculty: Each program (M.Ed. and Doctoral) was managed by a program coordinator and two to four faculty who serve as the "core faculty" for that program. The core faculty has the major responsibility for the design, conduct, management and evaluation of the curricular experiences for the entire length of the program. Additional faculty members provide instructional and/or supervisory input for the program, and they report their reactions, responses, and evaluation to the core faculty who are responsible for all professional judgements about students.

V. DEVELOPMENT

The Northeastern EPDA/PPS Center-Satellite project was a logical extension of a series of educational personnel development projects conducted at the University of Pittsburgh. Experiences in the conduct of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes, EPDA Guidance and Counseling Institutes, EPDA "Cluster" Center Activities, an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program and the TTT Project, all conducted by faculty of the Counselor Education Department of the University of Pittsburgh, strongly suggest that the model for personnel training and program development developed there provided a strong basis for the development of innovative counseling and teacher development services in the schools and the development of college and university educational personnel training programs. A forerunner of the Center-Satellite project was the EPDA Institute in Guidance and Counseling conducted at Pitt during 1970-71.

A. Fellowship Program to Train Developmental Counseling Specialists and Counselor Education Supervisors (1970-1971).

This educational personnel development project piloted several processes that were utilized in the Center-Satellite project. First, a mixed cost contract was negotiated combining Departmental and federal resources resulting in fellowship aid (federal source) and/or scholarship aid (local source) for all full time students. A total of 66 full time students participated. Of that total, 54 were Masters

students and 12 were doctoral students. Thirteen of the Masters and 6 of the doctoral students received an EPDA fellowship; all received tuition scholarships. Thus, joint support for training was demonstrated, as well as the 'multiplier effect' of the federal training dollar.

Second, the project attempted to recruit some teams of masters and doctoral level participants from the same geographical area or institution, with the intention of returning them to that area or institution, serving as a strategy to combine staff and program development goals. Participants were mutually selected by the Counselor Education department and by the institution. Of the doctoral students three teams of 2 students each were drawn from the same geographical area; two from San Diego, two from Berkeley, and two from the Rochester, New York area. The larger portion of Masters students were recruited from Western Pennsylvania or at large. Of the three teams, two returned intact to their institutions upon completion of the program.

Third, with respect to the training program itself, an emphasis was on the training of entry level counselor/consultants for urban settings <u>with</u> doctoral or post-doctoral level trainers of educational personnel specialists. A "double practicum" for doctoral students in counseling, group work, supervision and program development paralleled the emphasis of the entry level program and became a focal point around which a number of Center facilitated curricular changes were piloted.

In addition, experiences as the Appalachian Cluster Center for a group of EPDA Projects provided insights and valuable experiences in planning and conducting staff development activities for Counselor

Educators. Activities during 1970-71 included workshops on group counseling (New York City, May 8-9, 1971), and program development (Morgantown, W.Va., Dec. 8-9, 1971).

B. Center-Satellite Project

It is necessary to keep to the fore the prescriptive nature of the National PPS Center-Satellite program. The program design(EPDA/PPS Program Design, Sept., 1970) and subsequent OE documents (Special Programmatic Conditions, EPDA/PPS Program, 1971) provided an explicit structure within which the individual Centers and their constituent parts operated.

The problems of this change strategy as it related to the Northeastern Center have been discussed elsewhere (Ruch, 1974). In brief, the nature of the Satellite institutions, their experience in training activities and the complexities of the urban settings necessitated a more fluid, developmental approach.

In an earlier section (III) some general notions about this developmental strategy were presented. The initial projected strategy for the development of the individual Satellite projects is illustrated in the following chart. Two alternatives were proposed for Satellite growth and development. One alternative stresses the design, pilot and institutionalization of an innovative Pupil Personnel Service model training program over the three year period.

The other stresses the design, pilot, and integration of several innovative components of a Pupil Personnel Service training program over the three year period. In general, most followed this alternative.

The Center provided Satellites with both program development and

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR SATELLITE/PROJECTS

(Spring - 1971)	Year I (1971-72)	Year II (1972-73)	Year III (1973-74)
Identify Satellite Institutions & Personnel	Satellite Designs, Develops Innovative Model for P.P.S. Training	Satellite Pilots Innovative Model	Institutionalize Model
	OR		
Introduce New O.E. Guidelines & Priorities	Designs, develops and Pilots Component of P.P.S. Training	Institutionalize Component And Design, Develops Pilot Second Component	Integrate And Institutionalize Components

staff development assistance with either model for institutional change.

1. Center Development

Year I. The major tasks for the Center during the first year of operation were threefold. First, to establish all six components as the settings where change and development would take place and the Center as a set of resources, and processes to use them; not as a place. Second, to build a network whereby each component, Satellite and Center Demonstration, could teach and learn from one another. Third, to expand, explicate and make visible all facets of the overall program design.

Consistent with these three tasks, a number of activities and processes were started. Center co-ordinators made periodic visitations to the Satellites, participating in response to Satellite Directors' needs, goals, and issues. Three major meetings were held (Boston, Oct. 21-27, 1971; Pittsburgh, Jan. 9-10, 1972; and Washington, Apr. 26-28, 1972) where participants from all components could identify issues, show their progress and strategies, and plan mutual support activities. Where requested the Center facilitated between Satellite meetings or visitations. Finally, the Center and its Demonstration component hosted a National meeting of Center-Satellite Directors at Pittsburgh (Feb. 28 - Mar. 1, 1972). Satellites were invited to join in the dialogue around the Pittsburgh response to the National program design.

By the end of the first year, enough interaction among the various components within the project had occured to create a climate for mutual staff and program development--the primary agenda for the Center-

Satellite project.

Year II. During the summer of 1972 the Center sponsored the attendance of a number of participants (Center & Satellites) at an L.T.I. conducted training session in Aspen, Colorado. This resulted in an additional cadre of personnel across the project with a common experience and interest in the projects goals, etc. In addition, it served as a continuing focus for mutual support and development activities.

Following a fall Directors' planning meeting in Pittsburgh (Nov. 15, 1973) several staff and program development activities were conducted culminating in a series of six workshops. These activities highlighted most of the issues in the national program design and served as the major extensive development focus for Year II. Workshop included:

April 6-8, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "Humanistic Education" Buffalo, New York
May 2-4, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "Competency Based/Field Based Training" Boston, Massachusetts
May 16-18, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "The Administrator and P.P.S." Brockport, New York
May 23-25, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "The School as a Training Site" Canevin High School Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
June 7-8, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "School-University Cooperation: Implementing the Waddy Decree" Washington, D.C.
June 27-29, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop-- "The Multi-Cultural Community and the Counselor" Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

and are reported in detail in the Center report, CHANGES FACING PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES: TRAINING AND SERVICE, 1974.

In addition the Center sponsored training of personnel from Satellite projects at the Center Demonstration component. Joint recruitment hoped to establish strong placement possibilities back in the Satellite settings upon completion of training at Pittsburgh. Doctoral students were recruited from three of the five Satellites.

Year III. If the emphasis of the middle year was on extensive activities among the components; the emphasis this last year has been on intensive development within each Satellite. Moving toward institutionalization of project gains and further development of project strategies, co-ordinators played a larger role in working with individual projects. Workshops, visitations, demonstrations and direct consultation were primary modes of Center support. Again, the Center supported Satellite nominated personnel for training at Pittsburgh. Two new masters and two new doctoral students were involved in this exchange.

In sum, the Center, as a process, provided a network of support activities between and among the component training settings in the project.

2. Center Demonstration Component Development

Because of the inter-relationship between the Centers' demonstration activities and the full time training programs in the Department of Counselor Education, influences from Center project activities and practices directly influenced the more permanent structure of the Department.

Year I. Several issues generated by involvement in the Center-Satellite project, dominated the Department. They appear to be generic to training programs and the process of their resolution, annually, is a source of productive energy.

First, the nature of recruitment and selection is an issue of primary impact. Aspects of this issue central to the Department during this year were the recruitment and selection from minority populations and sharing selection with institutions to ensure placement following training. During this year, the Department recruited an increased number of minority students at both levels. In addition, it selected seven students directly from cooperating field sites - all local educational agencies. EPDA fellowships were used to facilitate this recruitment.

Second, the nature of field sites was a reoccuring issue. During Year I of this project, all primary field sites were a heterogeneous sample of local educational agencies.

Third, the nature of a "double practicum" or practica for trainers was at issue. A variety of models, structural arrangements and competency requirements were developed. Finally, the nature of a curricula core reflecting unique community or urban issues was started. Its structure, content, sequence and resources was a focal point for discussion.

Year II. These four issues remained as central to the development of the demonstration component. Recruitment and selection placed emphasis on minority populations and shifted to joint recruitment from Satellite projects and support for doctoral level training through the

use of graduate student assistantships. With regard to field sites, two changes were instituted. One, all urban sites were used. Two, a balance between traditional and nontraditional settings were developed.

"Double practica" and the core area "Community" were the major areas for curricula development. As an outgrowth of the "community" core mini courses in Black psychology, Counseling Minority Students, and Counseling Women were started.

Year III. The recruitment and selection issue, though always alive, was more responsive to a balance in minority populations and some joint recruitment with Satellites. All urban field sites of all kinds were maintained. Expansion of field sites to include Community Mental Health or Mental Health and Rehabilitation Center were conducted.

Curriculum development in the two areas, double practica for doctoral students and the community core for masters degree, students continued. To strengthen these curricular changes, teaching fellowships were budgeted and filled.

3. Satellite Development

Each Satellite project will trace the development of that project in the final report for that Satellite.

VI. MAJOR OUTCOMES

The complexity of this project makes the reporting of all meaningful outcomes especially challenging. In addition, the extension of time to complete all projected activities and the funding of an additional year for dissemination activities further complicates the task of organizing this section. What follows then, is an attempt to identify areas of gain directly or indirectly attributable to project events or processes. It will be left to the following documents in this series to embellish, delete, or substitute.

A. Center Component

It would appear that the major outcome from the Center component was that its processes were operationalized. As proposed, it did not become an entity in its own right, but remained essentially in process. Specifically:

- it supported six specific PPS training projects for three years, (through these projects entry level (T-'s) personnel have been trained, graduate faculty and supervisory personnel (TT's) retrained, and programs improved),

- it conducted twelve meetings bringing together representatives from all six projects for staff and program development,

- it provided for numerous intersite visitations, consultations, demonstrations, etc.,

- it supported the specific recruitment and training at the Center project of two masters students and six doctoral students from Satellites,

- it hosted a national Center-Satellite directors meeting attended by personnel from across the country,

- it supported attendance by key project personnel at numerous meetings, workshops, seminars, etc., related to the national PPS program,

- it provided for modest dissemination activities through project publications and documents, and

- it indirectly or directly provided for the continued development of faculty at the six institutions, supervisory personnel at more than six urban educational agencies, and the improvement of PPS services.

These gains were accomplished through a matrix of inter-institutional cooperation and support. Moreover, it established a process for staff and program development not found in either the NDEA Institute program or with Clustering in the EPDA Institute program.

B. Center Demonstration Component

As noted elsewhere, the Center Demonstration component encompassed the full time training programs of the Department of Counselor Education. The advantages of this structure are that project gains within the component are easily institutionalized and shared resources from the Department and project ensued the "multiplier" effects for the project. Those gains or outcomes reported here are already a part of the Departments program for 1974-75.

In general, project gains within the Center Demonstration component/Department of Counselor Education fall into three categories; personnel trained or retrained, new processes established, and specific curricular developments. Examples from each category follow:

(1) Personnel Trained or Retrained

A primary purpose of this project was the training or retraining of educational personnel.

T-'s. Over the three year period, this project, through the Center Demonstration component provided a full year masters level training for 138 students. By August 1974, of this total, 136 will have completed all degree requirements and 134 will have complete certification requirements as a School Counselor in Pennsylvania as either an Elementary (K-8) or Secondary (6-12) School Counselor.

Through the first two years of the project, over half of these students had accepted School or Agency Counseling positions. Continued graduate study at the post masters level was the full time activity for an additional significant portion of these students (25% and 14%). A larger range of other positions were accepted by 1972-73 graduates, reflecting the tightening educational job market.

TT's. Seventy-eight students completed a year or more full time graduate study as part of the Center Demonstration component. By August 1974, 17 of these students will have completed all degree requirements for the doctorate. An additional 35 will have completed all course requirements and are working on an approved research project.

Follow up data for the first two years of the project reflect

the commitment to graduate study on the part of these students (35%; 66%). The balance reported placement in PPS related positions, with few exceptions. The following chart reports this data.

Faculty Development. The involvement of the total Counselor Education faculty in this project by combining the Demonstration component with the Department proved to be a potent arrangement for faculty development. All faculty members participated fully in both the masters (T-'s) and the doctoral (TT's) training programs. Over the course of the project, all performed the following functions: supervision, advisement, field supervision, instruction and program planning. All were confronted with the goals and objectives of the national PPS model; as well as the realities of its implementation in Pittsburgh. The total faculty was involved in changing the nature of the field settings to include more urban sites, and the changing of the composition of the student body to be more representative of the urban community. Consequently, the faculty individually and collectively, became the implicit focal point for staff development and change to meet these new realities. As reported below, the new processes established and curricular changes developed attest to the potency of this model for faculty development.

In-Service. It became evident that field support was necessary for both the training of PPS specialists with a wider range of skills and the slow adoption of such an expanded role for PPS personnel in schools or agencies. During the past two years of the project, special in-service seminars were conducted for site personnel to acquaint them with the new PPS role/functions, nature of the Pitt training sequences

Follow-up of

CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT
(Department of Counselor Education)

Participants

Full Time Masters Students (T-'s)

	1971-72 (N=53)	1972-73 (N=43)
School Counselor	43%	30%
Agency Counselor	22%	26%
Teacher	5%	4%
Full time doctoral student	25%	14%
Other (moved, unable to contact, other job, etc.)	5%	26%

Full Time Doctoral Student (TT's)

	1971-72 (N=28)	1972-73 (N=22)
School Counselor	25%	9%
Agency Counselor	25%	14%
PPS or other Administrator	8%	9%
G.S.A.	21%	35%
Continuing Grad Study	14%	31%
Other	6%	2%

and potential roles for field personnel as trainees. In-service participants were nominated by the field sites and received graduate credit for completion of the seminar. During 1972-73 five participated; during 1973-74 six participated.

Satellite/Field Site Recruitment. The strategy of joint recruitment and selection was less than successful in this project. In retrospect, several factors mitigated against its potency. With respect to recruitment from field sites, the projects' changing sites to respond to changing student and placement needs was a limiting factor. Furthermore, the inability of sites to guarantee placement following training destroyed the intent of the strategy.

With respect to Satellites; reduction of faculty, differing emphasis placed on faculty roles and the complexities of urban universities, limited the strategy. In all cases, Satellite nominations were for field based personnel, not 'university types.'

Timing of this project played a confounding role. The budget squeeze was just starting in 1971-72 and became a reality by 1973-74. While the need for additional minority personnel and the 'new PPS professional' exists, the ability of schools or universities to hire new personnel appears very limited.

(2) New or Expanded Processes

Two major processes, integral to the life of the Department, were changed through involvement with this Center-Satellite project. The first, recruitment and selection; the second, field sites. A word about each:

Recruitment and Selection. The annual recruitment and selection of

a student population representative of an urban area is a process that requires a significant amount of energy. All faculty play some role in this process; interviewing, serving on admission decision committees, providing recruiting information and making appropriate contacts.

Over the three years of the project the per cent of full time students from minority populations increased from about 25% during 1971-72 to about 40% for the last two years of the project. Data on the composition of the students participating in the Demonstration component is presented in the following table.

Field Sites. Although the evaluation and rationale for field site involvements is discussed elsewhere (Becker & Ruch, in press) several changes should be noted.

First, over the three years of project involvement, sites became more urban and within the urban community a balance between traditional educational agencies, mental health agencies and non-traditional settings. These trends are illustrated in the appended charts which report field sites for each year of the project.

Second, during the last two years formal attempts were made to improve coordination between the field sites and the on-campus programs through the vehicle of a monthly Field Site Task Force Meeting. A supervisory level person from each site meet monthly with various faculty to discuss various issues regarding training and delivery of service. This arrangement has proven to be a useful vehicle for exchange of information, mutual planning, and support. It has allowed the field/campus communication to become more open to the

(CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT)

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION

Composition of Student Groups

1971-72

Program	Female			Male			Total
	Black	White	Other	Black	White	Other	
Masters (T-'s)	9	22	-	4	18	-	53
Doctoral (TT's)	3	6	-	4	14	-	27
Satellite's Field Sites	-	-	-	-	1	-	1

1972-73

Program	Female			Male			Total
	Black	White	Other	Black	White	Other	
Masters (T-'s)	9	11	-	14	9	-	43
Doctoral (TT's)							
Satellite's	-	1	-	1	1	-	3
G.S.A.'s	1	4	-	3	3	-	11
Other	2	5	-	2	11	-	20

1973-74

	Female			Male			Total
	Black	White	Other	Black	White	Other	
Masters (T-'s)	7	12	-	10	11	-	40
Satellites	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
Doctoral (TT's)							
Satellite's	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
G.S.A.'s	1	3	-	3*	3	-	10
Other	3	5	-	5	5	-	18

(* 1 from Satellite)

direct improvement of all institutions.

Coupled with the in-service program discussed above, these meetings have contributed to the development of a network of urban training sites, which now are being used by other training programs within the University including: Rehavilitation Counseling, Social Work, Educational Psychology, and Teacher Education.

(3) Curricular Development

As the projects influences reached into every part of the Department, minor and major curricular changes followed. There is no doubt that individual faculty members expanded their own teaching and course materials in direct response to the more heterogeneous student body.

As important as these individual changes are, two major curricular revisions were accomplished during the past three years. At the masters level a Community/Urban Core was introduced. At the doctoral level, "double practica" were expanded and defined.

Community/Urban Core

The Community/Urban Core of the Day Masters program grew out of an increased awareness of the importance of developing counseling models within a social context. Since all of the masters students were working in an urban setting with minority populations, it was felt that a broad look at the background and social problems of urban minorities, at the beginning of the program, was essential.

Since the students themselves had expressed a need for this approach, the program was devised to include student and faculty participation. Initially, the students were asked what topics they felt

would be relevant to them, and from this input a topical program was developed. The students selected four representatives who, along with three faculty advisors, were responsible for planning speakers, films, trips, etc. Emphasis was put on obtaining speakers from the community so that the students would be able to experience the input more directly.

The three main areas covered were (a) ethnic and other minority group issues, with emphasis on the Black perspective, inter-racial counseling, racism and racialism; (b) social service problems, including drugs, correctional institutions, abortion, law enforcement, legal aid, mental retardation and physical disabilities, etc.; (c) educational counseling, such as public school and vocational counseling, family counseling and innovative therapeutic counseling.

From this broad perspective the students were then able, through electives, i.e., drug education, issues in counseling women, etc., to delve more deeply into specific areas of concern. Another goal of the Core was to use many of the issues and questions raised in the Community/Urban core as a motivating factor for discussion in other classes, particularly in counseling theory and practicum and group process; this carry-over was helpful in the development of a total counseling perspective.

Electives

Five weeks before the end of this section of the Community/Urban core, the students were asked to evaluate their experience, up to this point, in the Community/Urban core, and to assist in planning electives. The students were encouraged to design seminars in which they

will initiate their own learning process, as well as workshops which will be supervised by Counselor Education faculty. Students expressed an interest in the following areas: drugs, innovative therapeutic techniques, inter-racial counseling, alternative life styles, alcoholism, and legal issues.

Double Practicum

All doctoral students were assigned in groups of two or three to a faculty member responsible for developing and facilitating the appropriate experience for masters level students. A faculty member, together with two or three doctoral students, constitutes a "Core Teaching Unit." Each unit had the responsibility for planning, developing and managing a group of entry level students.

The core unit meets weekly for a teaching seminar. The objectives of this seminar were as follows:

1) to help doctoral students to synthesize their own understanding of the appropriate theory and to help them in resolving their understanding of their communication and facilitation as teachers,
2) to plan the experiences for the entry level students, and
3) to decide the manner in which additional faculty would be involved as resource persons.

During the first trimester, doctoral students were assigned to counseling practicum and social process sections for double practicum. During the second and third trimester doctoral students could elect double practicum in supervision of counseling, supervision of supervision, and teaching counseling theory.

A double practicum experience(s) has a major part of a student's degree work in Counselor Education and is the focal part for organizing other learnings, courses, etc. In effect, the double practicum has become a practicum in some phase of higher education.

Other Curricular Activities. Additional curricular changes occurring during the period of this project included:

(1) further development of the policy sciences for Counselor Education seminar sequence.

(2) joint teaching with Social Work in training School Social Workers,

(3) presentations in several sections of Education Administration Courses, and

(4) conduct of several in-service courses for Pittsburgh Public Schools. (city sponsored)

C. Satellite Components

Each Satellite will report on major outcomes in their individual reports.

VII. ISSUES, PROBLEMS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A recurrent theme of this report has been the dynamic nature of the Center-Satellite project. There are several unfinished activities, gains as yet uninstitutionalized, and personnel just completing their formal training. Final conclusions and recommendations will be left to others writing in this series. What follows are a number of issues that were surfaced through experiences with Center-Satellite. Where recommendations appear useful or as a stimulant for further examination and discussion they will be reported.

A. Issues Related to the Center-Satellite Model

There is no question that the Center-Satellite model was an aggressive attempt to break from the Office of Education's previous funding models. The program introduced a number of elements that hither-to-fore were absent in combination from EPDA programming including: explicit multi year funding, a minority recruitment emphasis, prescriptive program model, inter-institutional subcontracting and combined staff and program development goals and objectives. A discussion of the limitations of this model appears in the Center report, CHANGES FACING PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES: TRAINING AND SERVICE, (1974). The complexity of these inter-related elements posed interesting and difficult questions for project personnel. The prioritizing of goals and strategies within the programmatic constraints was a constant

source of creative tension and stress. The development of a workable time line and a definition of obtainable gains were of significant impact and constantly at issue. In the main, the challenge was to press for program development within program guidelines. Specific issues included:

(1) Nature of Competing Objectives. While the overall goals and objectives were clearly articulated in the program model, over the course of the project, several appeared to be in conflict. Goals for improving programs often involved resources, policies, and practices not directly related to the project, per se. Needs for retraining graduate faculty or supervisory personnel imply institutional rewards for engagement in new behaviors. However, such behaviors are those not traditionally rewarded in higher education or by large district administration.

(2) Nature of "Community". The program model clearly mandated more participative involvement from community or constituent groups. The program emerged during the aftermath of both the Civil Rights and Student Activists demonstrations. Who are the 'communities' for a graduate training program in the human services professions? Some would agree that graduate students should be more involved as a 'community'. Others targeted minority populations. Clearly both groups were not involved in most training or service programs.

As a matter of fact, this project was much aggressive in developing structures and strategies for involving students into a 'sense of community' than in re-structuring school-community relations, governance, etc. through site committees. Furthermore, the flow of com-

munity "input" into the training was enhanced by new curricular developments and recruitment strategies. Community involvement can be movement of community into School or University space, as well as school or university involvement in the communities.

(3) Nature of Power Relationships. The PPS Center-Satellite model implicitly and explicitly granted powers to the Center institutions. The model called for the Center to 'train' Satellite personnel. Schon (1971) and others (PROJECT OPEN, 1974) have argued that this model for innovation is unlikely to work for most human services institutions. Yet, the potency of institution to institution change (i.e., subcontracting, coordination, etc.), strategy has been demonstrated through the experiences of this project.

(4) The Change Strategy. Implicit in the national model is the notion that by training or retraining personnel, programs will change substantially. Furthermore, the model assumes that changing a part of the institution (PPS training department or service unit) can be accomplished without direct involvement with both other units and key social processes.

Changes in universities ultimately must deal with the role of "professor" and what institutional and social processes support these balances. Similarly, the role of "counselor" or "supervisor" in the schools must be re-structured and rewards built for new functions. Training, per se, does not appear to be a powerful enough strategy to attack these structures.

(5) Role of the School in Training. The experiences with this project support the notion that the school can play a significant role

in training of educational personnel. However, new structures, skills and support must be found to accomplish this goal. The conflict between the schools primary mission, delivery of service, and training needs to be explored and procedures to deal with incidents maintained.

(6) Support for the PPS Role Model. This project found strong support for the role model for the PPS worker as articulated in the National Program. Where the project was able to recruit, train, place and support this 'new professional', strong evidence is emerging in support of this role description for the PPS Specialist.

It is RECOMMENDED that the Office of Education continue to support activities and the training of PPS personnel reflective of the role model outlined in the Center-Satellite program description.

B. Issues Related to Center Management

Within the program design, each project was free and encouraged to develop creative responses. These can be reduced to the following management issues:

(1) Selection of Satellites. The process of Satellite selection in the Northeast was a difficult one. The timing of the introduction of Center-Satellite into EPDA programs caught some interested projects in 'midstream' having developed objectives for proposed projects other than those of the national program. Still others, perhaps interested in Satellite participation were unaware of the new program. Satellite selection was completed in a relatively short period of time. Selection then was, at best, a difficult process.

It is RECOMMENDED to the Office of Education personnel that a Center project be given at least six months to a year to identify and

negotiate Satellite subcontracts.

(2) Multi Year Funding. With the multiplicity of project goals, and objectives, multi year funding was both necessary and very helpful. While three years is a significant improvement over one year contracts, not all the institutional changes contemplated or proposed were accomplished during this period. Institutional change takes time.

It is RECOMMENDED to the Office of Education personnel that three year funding be considered minimum with options to continue to five years when significant institutional change in social agencies like schools is contemplated.

One of the real issues for the Center was what multi year funding arrangement to negotiate with Satellites through subcontracts. One posture was to re-negotiate annually, but not to offer or 'guarantee' a three year life for a Satellite project. The alternative, followed by this Center, was to provide each Satellite with the same conditions the Office of Education placed on the Center. In effect, all succeeded or failed together.

In retrospect, two observations in support of this latter posture are of merit. First, it set the conditions for a developmental process throughout the project and lessened the Center to Satellite press with its obvious resistances. Second, the rate of Satellites development varied. Projects that might have been dropped at the end of the first year made dramatic gains by the close of the project.

(3) Nature of Center-Satellite Coordination.

The Northeastern Center employed the notion of a coordinator as the integral link between Center and Satellite. This role sought to create

a process by which information and resources could flow between Center and Satellite.

Aside from the obvious personality issues surrounding such a position, the role was not without its mixed functions and overlapping responsibilities. Time and common experiences appeared to be related to the more successful utilization of this management scheme.

It is RECOMMENDED that the coordinator model is a useful management device, but requires more role definition than was utilized in the project to date.

(4) Institution-Project Overlaps. Should projects like Center-Satellite be set up as temporary systems or should they encompass a total, existing entity like a Department, School, etc? While the rate of development may be slower, the chances for the institutionalization of project related gains appear to favor the overlap strategy. Within the Northeastern project, several satellites (Pittsburgh, D.C., and Canevin) along with the Center used this strategy.

It is RECOMMENDED to Office of Education personnel that future projects be so constituted so as to overlap the targeted institution so as to maximize chances for institutionalization, available resources, and extend project goals and strategies.

(5) Institutional Rewards and Support for Participation. The history of experimental, high risk projects in higher education such as Center-Satellite is replete with examples of non-institutional support for faculty who made significant contributions. The nature of training activities and the higher education reward structure are in conflict as are supervisory activities and administrative demands.

Center-Satellite experienced these conflicts. Personnel who worked on the project, were nominated for training or who were hired through project funds have not always been supported, rewarded, or retained. The problem is usually not with the Director, but rather with junior faculty who contribute significantly to project activities, but do not concurrently "publish"!

It is RECOMMENDED to Office of Education personnel that institutions participating in such projects be required to explicate if participation on such projects will be considered in for salary promotion, or tenure decisions.

Center-Satellite in Retrospect

The direction of this project has been a most challenging and rewarding activity. The model and its potential for developing more potent and meaningful services at both the University and the Schools is as yet unlimited. The continuation of project activities need not rely on federal dollars, but rather in the commitments and hard work of those involved. Center-Satellite started a series of processes that are worthy of nourishment and further development.

APPENDIX

NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS CENTER-SATELLITE PROJECT MANAGEMENT & STAFF

CENTER

Co-Directors

Charles P. Ruch
Thomas Meade
Joseph Werlinich

Satellite Co-ordinators

Wade Baird Mark Peterson Joseph Werlinich	Boston
Robert Campbell	Buffalo
Canice Connors	Buquesne-Carlow
Patrick Malley	SUCNY-Brockport
Thomas Meade	D.C. Schools

Staff

Carolyn Clark
Helen Farkas
Marjorie Osborne
Karen Plavan
Toni Taylor
Gretchen Boss

Leadership Training Institute Fellow

Wilma Smith

NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS CENTER-SATELLITE PROJECT
MANAGEMENT & STAFF

SATELLITE PROJECTS

Director	Satellite
Jeremiah Donigian	SUCNY-Brockport
William Faith	Duquesne-Carlow
Doris Swanson Hill	Buffalo Public Schools
Jane O'Hern	Boston University
Margaret Labat & Myrtice Tobias	D.C. Public Schools

NORTHEASTERN EPDA/PPS CENTER-SATELLITE PROJECT
MANAGEMENT & STAFF

CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT

FACULTY	POSITION
Wade Baird	1972 Coordinator, 1st Year Evening Master's Program 1973 Coordinator, 2nd Year Evening Master's Program
Margaret Becker	1972 Coordinator-Specialist Diploma Program 1973 Coordinator, Full-Time Master's Program (Day)
David Botwin	1973 Coordinator, 1st Year Evening Master's Program
Robert Campbell	
Canice Connors	
James Curl	
Robert Dilts	
Nancy Elman	
Geraldine Fox	
Donald Giarrusso	
Susan Gross	
Beverly Harden	
Frank Lackner	
Patrick Malley	1972 Coordinator, Full-Time Doctoral Program 1973 Coordinator, Full-Time Doctoral Program
Thomas Meade	1972 Coordinator, Part-Time Doctoral Program 1973 Coordinator, Part-Time Doctoral Program
John Mosley	
Charles Ruch	Chairman
Judith Scott	1972 Coordinator, Specialist Diploma Program 1973 Coordinator, Specialist Diploma Program
Wilma Smith	L.T.I. Fellow
Gordon Spice	
Joseph Werlinich	1972 Coordinator, Full-Time Master's Program (Day)

CHRONOLOGY OF CENTER SPONSORED MEETINGS

August 26-27, 1971	Center/Satellite Directors' Meeting -- Pittsburgh
October 21-22, 1971	Center/Satellite Workshop -- Boston
January 9-11, 1972	Center/Satellite Workshop -- Pittsburgh
February 28 - March 1, 1972	National Center/Satellite Directors' Workshop -- Pittsburgh
April 26-28, 1972	Center/Satellite Workshop -- Washington, D.C.
July 30 - August 11, 1972	L.T.I. Meeting Aspen
November 15, 1972	Center/Satellite Directors' Meeting -- Pittsburgh
April 6-8, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "Humanistic Education" Buffalo, New York
May 2-4, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "Competency Based/Field Based Training" Boston, Massachusetts
May 16-18, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "The Administrator and P.P.S." Brockport, New York
May 23-25, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "The School As a Training Site" Canevin High School Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
June 7-8, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "School-University Cooperation: Implementing the Waddy Decree" Washington, D.C.
June 27-29, 1973	Center/Satellite Workshop -- "The Multi-Cultural Community and the Counselor" Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
July 25-26, 1974	Center/Satellite Directors' Wrap-up Workshop Falmouth, Massachusetts

A NOTE ABOUT CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT PARTICIPANTS

Throughout the three years of this project a shared-cost budget was developed annually between the Office of Education and the Department of Counselor Education, University of Pittsburgh, for the Center Demonstration component of the project. This fiscal arrangement provided for the cost of instruction for all full time masters and doctoral students; consequently, all received scholarship support.

In addition, fellowships or assistantships were budgeted annually. During 1971-72, 13 EPDA fellowships were awarded at both the masters (T-) and doctoral (TT) levels with joint field site-university recruitment for doctoral fellows. The following year, 1972-73, 12 graduate assistantships were awarded to doctoral students for work both in the Department and in field sites along with two fellowships for doctoral students from Satellite projects. This last year, 1973-74, 7 teaching fellowships were awarded to doctoral students, six EPDA fellowships and two internships.

Participants and the nature of their project support follows.

1971-72

Full Time Masters

Amenhauser, Carl
Bartholomew, Mary Jane
Bennati, Timothy
Beisler, Paul
Cava, Joseph
Cowan, Michael
Depew, Nancy
Dewey, Adelaide
Doren, Marietta
Ecker, Douglas
Fitch, Jon
Fozouni, Sherry
Gallagher, Philip
Gallaway, Richard (T-)
Garda, Jan (T-)
Garnar, Donald
Geis, Sharon
Grinston, Lloyd (T-)
Hahn, Charles
Hefner, James
Hill, Gloria (T-)
Hooe, Shelley
Ingram, Etta
Jethroe, Gill
Johnston, Louise
Krebs, John
Lesser, Bobbie
Mahler, Timothy
Marcavage, John
Marlier, Yvonne
McNeely, Larry
Miyares, Carlos
Mosley, Richard (T-)
Moss, Mel (T-)
Murdock, Louis (T-)
Napier, Pauline
Penman, Deborah
Porritt, Anne
Pryce, Nancy
Reichbaum, Lee
Robinson, Clarence
Rodgers, Mary Lou
Smith, Harry
Snow, Joyce
Sovchen, Richard
Stanton, Martha
Stronza, Linda Lee
Sunner, John

Full Time Masters, 1971-72, cont.

Sturm, Thomas

Vujan, Andrea

Wiles, Leon

Woods, Gerry

Rhody, Nan

Full Time Doctoral, 1971-72

Aylmer, M.M.

Berkowitz, Steven

Bernstein, Lawrence

Burkley, Kenneth EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Oakdale

Choecos, Lilia

Degnan, James EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Canevin/Boston

Doody, Robert

Edwards, Joshua

Fair, Justin

Fogarty, Elizabeth EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Home for Crippled Children

Forrest, Ann

Girard, Gilles

Griffin, James

Huber, Barbara

Jasper, Sheila EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Penn-Trafford

Jutte, Jack

Krebs, Charles

Malcolm, Jean

Miller, Norman

Rizzo, Gary

Rosenbaum, Robert

Ruffins, James EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Braddock

Rutenberg, Sandra

Shiring, James

Smith, Petronilla

Teeter, Robert EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Mars

Wyckoff, Richard

Wright, Larry

1972-73

Full Time Masters

Abraham, Henrietta
Berry, Arnold
Biebel, Mary
Boscia, Frances
Boston, Kenneth
Coffman, James
Cooney, Carl
Davis, Charlotte
D'Emilio, Timothy
Durham, Jarrett
Estes, Kelley
Fadale, Priscilla
Fitch, Sherry
Gay, Doretha
Grzenda, Gerald
Jennings, Antoinette
Laster, Atlas
Lester, Bobbie
Montemurro, Larry
Moon, Samuel
Muth, James
Nicolella, Carol
Owens, Roger
Palazzi, Elizabeth
Patten, Michael
Poulton, Richard
Rainbow, Kathryn
Rettger, Sheila
Riddick, Lewis
Sandidge, Barbara
Saunders, Charles
Schiller, Douglas
Smith, Delbert
Smith, Walter
Sullivan, Maureen
Thomas, Daniel
Todt, Laura
Vargo, David
Weston, Lloyd
Wiles, Maliaka
Wright, Ernest
X, Xabanisa
McClellan, Linda
Murdock, Lou

1972-73

Full Time Doctoral

Baton, Barbara

Bernstein, Lawrence GSA

Bryan, Maryann GSA

Burkley, Kenneth GSA

Carlivati, Philip EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Brockport

Deal, Grady

Fitch, Jon

Flanagan, Michael GSA

Garnar, Darris

Haymon, Francene GSA

Heckel, William GSA

Holland, Harold

Ingram, Etta

Jordan, Patricia

Krebs, Charles GSA

Krebs, John

McMurray, Donald

McNeely, Larry

Melodini, Edward

Murdock, Louis

Person, James EPDA Doctoral Fellow/Buffalo

Piepgrass, Eileen

Robinson, Catherine

Ruffins, James GSA

Rutenberg, Sandra GSA

Shur, Sharon

Singer, Terry

Stingle, David

Von Brauchitsch, Marilyn

Walker, Catherine GSA

Wiles, Leon GSA

Fogarty, Elizabeth GSA

1973-74

Full Time Masters

Birnie, David
Bowman, Carter (D.C. Satellite)
Brown, Charles
Burroughs, Sharon
Coachman, Winifred
Coane, Ethan
Conley, Sheila
Dixon, Gladys
Edmonds, Garrette
Ely, Jo Ellen
Flournoy, Michael
Fuller, Susan
Gilmore, Jack (D.C. Satellite)
Hainesworth, Veronica
Haldeman, J. David
Hall, Pauline
Hall, Sherry
Hill, Myra
Holmes, Miriam
Ielase, Felix
Jones, Tyler
Kidd, James
Kimmel, Joan
Klingelhofer, George
Lankin, Laurie
Meekins, William
Milliones, Richard
Newman, Nancy
Ogrodnik, Ronald
Pisano, Mary Jo
Rebel, John
Rodgers, Gina
Schminkey, Fred
Sizemore, Robert
Skea, Brian
Smith, Christine
Smith, Walter
Teuter, Ursula
Vesper, Richard
Ware, Marcia
Wetzel, Bernard
White, Beverly
Young, Arthur

1973-74

Full Time Doctoral

Bangert, Stephen

Baton, Barbara Teaching Fellow

Bowers, Robert

Campbell, Lucenia

Cooney, Carl

Davidow, Liz Writing Assistant/ EPDA Diss. Amend.

Davis, Charles

Estes, Kelly

Fozouni, Sherry

Haymon, Francene EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Pittsburgh

Heckel, William Teaching Fellow

Holmes, Robert

Jordan, Patricia Teaching Fellow

Laster, Atlas EPDA Doctoral Fellow/ Pittsburgh

Martin, Anna

McMurray, Donald Teaching Fellow

Montemurro, Larry

Muth, James Teaching Fellow

Paladino, Peter

Palazzi, Elizabeth

Perelman, Stanley EPDA Doctoral Fellow/D.C.

Person, James EPDA Extern

Poole, Rachel

Rainbow, Kathy

Riddick, Lewis

Rutherford, George EPDA Doctoral Fellow/D.C.

Samuels, Charelle Teaching Fellow

Scher, Michael

Siegfried, Robert

Voegele, Victoria

Von Brauchitsch, Marilyn Teaching Fellow

Wiles, Leon Teaching Fellow

Carlivati, Phil EPDA Extern

CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT

FIELD SITES
1971-72

Primary (Students spend 1-2 days/week; all year)

Braddock	Urban, small city School District
Canevin	Suburban, diocesan High School
Home for Crippled Children	Regional Comprehensive Rehabilitation Center
Mars	Rural, suburban School District
Oakdale	Regional, Youth Development Center
Penn-Trafford	Urban, rural School District
Westinghouse	Urban, city High School

Secondary (Students spend ½ - 1 day/week; half year)

Allegheny Community College	Urban and suburban campuses
Oakmont	Suburban School District
Rochester Mental Health Center	Rural, suburban agency
Karma House	Urban agency
Hampton	Suburban School District
Holy Rosary	Urban, parocial Elementary
Western Psychiatric Institute Clinic	Urban agency
Grubstake	Residential agency
Youth Learning Center	Urban agency

CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT

FIELD SITES
1972-73

Primary (Students spend 1-2 days/week; all year)

Braddock	Urban, small city School District
Westinghouse	Urban, city, High School
Holy Rosary	Urban, parochial Elementary School
Canevin	Suburban diocesan High School
Oakdale	Regional Youth Development Center
Home for Crippled Children	Regional Comprehensive Rehabilitation Center
Greenfield	Urban, city School
Herron Hill	Urban, city School
Northview Heights	Urban, city School
Lawrenceville	Urban, parochial School

Secondary (Students spend ½ - 1 day/week; half year)

Manpower	Residential agency
University of Pittsburgh Counseling Center	Urban University
Warrendale Youth Development Center	Agency
South Hills Family Center	Suburban agency
Operation Dig	Urban agency
Dixmont State Hospital	Rural, suburban agency
Western Psychiatric Institute Clinic	Urban agency

CENTER DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT

FIELD SITES
1973-74

Primary (Students spend 1-2 days/week; all year)

North Allegheny School	Suburban School District
Schenley High School	Urban, city
Fifth Avenue High School	Urban, city
Holmes	Urban, city
St. Francis	Urban agency
MYCODA	Urban agency
University Counseling Center	Urban University
Westinghouse High School	Urban, city
Arsenal	Urban, city
St. Richards Elementary	Urban, parochial
Braddock High	Urban, small city
Lawrenceville Elementary, Middle, and High School	Urban, parochial
McKeesport School District	Urban, small city
WPIC Oakland Team	Urban agency

NATIONAL PPS PROGRAM
DISSEMINATION AND ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT

As an amendment to this grant, a separate series of activities were conducted to further explicate and disseminate several substitive issues implicit in the National PPS program.

During 1971-72 this amendment sponsored a major meeting, the Lake Wilderness PPS Conference, and a number of follow-up sessions regionally to further conceptualize and describe the 'new professional.' These materials were widely disseminated.

During 1972-73, the amendment supported a writer/historian at each of the seven Centers who responded to a series of issues/questions regarding the development of key strategies inherent in the Center-Satellite Model. These reports were widely disseminated. In addition, at the request of the Office of Education, personnel from the Northeastern Center and OE personnel enjoyed in-site visits and staff development activities to explore dimensions of project management.

During 1973-74, case study/visitations to modal, representative schools where PPS changes were developed were conducted, and a report/analysis of these case study strategies is forthcoming and will also be disseminated to a number of audiences.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M., and L.V. Cady, "Comments on the Northwest Cluster Center at the University of Wyoming," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 13:228-30, Mar. 1974.

Becker, M., and C. Ruch, "Field Site: Place or Process?" Couns. Ed. & Sup., in press.

EPDA/PPS Program Design. Washington, DC: Office of Education; Bureau of Educational Personnel Development; Teacher Improvement Branch, September 1971.

Forest, D.U., and D. Malcolm, "Clustering in Counselor Education," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 13:227-8, Mar. 1974.

Malcolm, D., "The Center/Satellite Model: Grand Strategy for Change," Personnel & Guid. J., 52:303-10, Jan. 1974.

Malcolm, D., and J. Brown, A Plan Called Clustering: National Report on EPDA/PPS Clustering 1969-70 and 1970-71. Final Report. San Diego: San Diego State College Foundation, June 1972.

McGreevy, C.P., "A New Design of Pupil Personnel Services Programs Utilized by the U.S. Office of Education (BEPD)," Counseling Psychologist, 2:88-91, 1971.

Moore, G.D., and G. Margolis, "A Review of the L.T.I. for P.P.S.," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 10:219-23, Spring 1971.

Moore, G., et. al., Pupil Personnel Services: Where Are We? Where Are We Going? Working Papers: Leadership Training Institute; Atlanta Workshop, January 25-8, 1970. Buffalo, N.Y.: University Press at Buffalo, 1970.

Moore, J.W., "Comment," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 10:224-6, Spring 1971.

Poling, H.E., "Comment on Clustering," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 13:231-2, Mar. 1974.

PROJECT OPEN, A Position Statement on the National Network for Educational Reform, (Sponsored by the TTT Program), Oct. 2, 1972, mimeo.

Riccio, A.C., "Comment," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 10:229-31, Spring 1971.

Salim, M., "Comment," Couns. Ed. & Sup., 10:227-8, Spring 1971.

Schon, D., Beyond the Stable State. New York: Random House, 1971.